

#### **IV. Remarks**

Reconsideration and reexamination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested. After entering this amendment, claims 1-26 remain pending.

##### *Amendments to the Drawings*

Figure 4 of the drawings has been amended by removing the reference character "50"; which was not mentioned in the description.

Figure 10A has been amended to by adding the line 10B-10B indicating a cross-sectional view as shown in Figure 10B.

The Examiner objected the reference characters "2-2" in Figure 2 and "9B-9B" in Figure 9A. As previously shown in the changes to the Specification section of this Response, paragraph [0011] has been amended to insert the reference character "2-2". Furthermore, paragraphs [0017.1] and [0018.1] have been added to the Specification to reference the reference characters "9B-9B" in Figure 9A and "10B-10B" in Figure 10A, respectively.

##### *Claim Objections*

The Examiner objected to claim 2 because of the term "inner perimeter edge" in line 2 of claim 2 is not consistent with the original term "inner peripheral edge" in claim 1, line 5. Claim 2 has been amended to replace the term "inner perimeter edge" with the term "inner peripheral edge".

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected to because of the term "outer perimeter edge" in line 1 of claim 8 and in line 1 of claim 9 is not consistent with the original term "outer peripheral edge" in claim 1, line 4. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to replace the term "outer perimeter edge" with the term "outer peripheral edge".

##### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,531,181 to Cookingham ("Cookingham"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Cookingham contains all of the elements of the invention as claimed, except for (1) indicia formed in one of the first

and second surfaces of a gage and (2) the gage plate being transparent. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to provide indicia into one of the first and second surfaces of a transparent polycarbonate plastic plate to carry effectively the light from the source to the desired display areas through the indicia for an evenly distributed illumination of the displays.

When making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the cited reference must provide some motivation, suggestion or teaching to render the claims of the present invention as obvious. The Cookingham reference itself provides no such motivation. The relied upon reference lacks any teaching that would motivate or suggest using a transparent plate. Nor is there a suggestion or motivation to provide indicia formed into the surface of the plate that would pick up ambient light and supplied light from a light source, wherein the light source is positioned within a central region defined by an inner peripheral edge to illuminate the indicia through the transmission of light through an inner peripheral edge, within the thickness, of the plate itself. The only motivation hinted at is in the present application itself. However, the present application cannot be the source of the required motivation because a hindsight reconstruction of the application is improper. In the reference, the pointer is not illuminated through a perpendicular edge of the pointer, but rather through a side section of the pointer. The requisite motivation is not provided and therefore, the rejection on 35 U.S.C. §103 thereon should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, and 25, these claims are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons given above.

Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 15-18 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cookingham in view of either U.S. Patent No. 6,848,799 to Kalantar, U.S. Patent No. 6,454, 422 to Williams, U.S. Patent No. 3,131,607 to Hardesty or U.S. Patent 6,302,551 to Matumoto. These claims are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons given above in support of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

September 12, 2005  
Date

  
John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57,414)

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheets 3 and 6

**III. Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheets of drawings replaces prior sheets 3 and 6 and includes changes to Figures 4 and 10A.